UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,770	09/23/2003	Teodoro Cipresso	SVL920020058US1	4364

24033	7590	08/21/2006

KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP
315 S. BEVERLY DRIVE
210
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212

EXAMINER
HONEYCUTT, KRISTINA B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 08/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/669,770	CIPRESSO ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Kristina B. Honeycutt	2178	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *6/5/06*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the amendment filed June 5, 2006.

This action is made **Final**.

2.   Claims 1-18 remain pending in the case. Claims 1, 7 and 13 are independent

claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.   Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 16 and 18 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

as being anticipated by Davis et al. (U.S. Patent 5657259; date of patent August 12,

1997; filed January 21, 1994).

Regarding independent claim 1, Davis discloses an article of manufacture for use in a

computer system for converting a text representation of a number into a numeric

representation of the number, said article of manufacture comprising a computer-

useable storage medium having a computer program embodied in said medium which

causes the computer system to execute the computer program to perform operations,

the operations comprising:

- converting the text representation of the number into a description of the

  number's format (Fig. 2, 3, 6; col. 3, lines 50-53; col. 5, lines 48-50 – as

  demonstrated in the figures and cited text, Davis teaches converting text to a

  TCanonicalNumber which is linked to a formatter);

- mapping the description of the number's format to a sequence of conversion

  code (col. 3, lines 50-53; col. 15, lines 41-60 – as demonstrated in the cited text,

  Davis teaches using a TCanonicalNumberFormatter to convert the

  TCanonicalNumber (description of the number's format) through the virtual

  method TextToCanonicalNumber. In other words, the TCanonicalNumber is

  mapped to the conversion code used to convert text to a number); and

- converting the text representation of the number into the numeric representation

  of the number by use of the sequence of conversion code (Fig. 3, 6; col. 3, lines

  50-53, 65-67; col. 4, lines 1-2; col. 5, lines 48-50; col. 15, lines 54-60 – as

  demonstrated in the figures and cited text, Davis teaches converting text to a

  number using the TCanonicalNumber and TCanonicalNumberFormatter).

Regarding dependent claim 4, Davis discloses the article of manufacture of claim 1

wherein:

- the sequence of conversion code for converting the text representation of the

  number into the numeric representation of the number comprises an assignment

  statement (col. 9, lines 40-62; col. 10, lines 7-22; col. 15, lines 41-52 – as

  demonstrated in the cited text, Davis teaches set statements used when

  converting text into a number).

Regarding dependent claim 6, Davis discloses the article of manufacture of claim 1

wherein:

- if the text representation of the number does not convert into the description of

  the number's format, then not executing the subsequent mapping and converting

  steps (col. 5, lines 48-55 – as demonstrated in the cited text, Davis teaches not

  converting text when the number is out of bounds).

Regarding claims 7, 10, 12, 13, 16 and 18, the claims reflect the method and

computer system for performing the operations of claims 1, 4 and 6 and are rejected

along the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 2, 8 and 14 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Davis in view of Turpin et al. (U.S. Patent 5608898; date of patent

March 4, 1997; filed November 12, 1992).

Regarding dependent claims 2, 8 and 14, Davis does not disclose the description of

the number's format is a picture string. Turpin teaches a number format as a picture

string (col. 10, lines 11-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art, having the teachings of Davis and Turpin before him at the time the invention was

made, to modify the description taught by Davis to include a picture string as taught by

Turpin, because using a picture string as the description of the number's format, as

taught by Turpin (col. 10, lines 11-16), would provide a representation of the format that

text should be converted to.

5.   Claims 3, 9 and 15 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Davis in view of Omori (U.S. Pub. No. 20040086861; publication date

May 6, 2004; filed October 16, 2002).

Regarding dependent claims 3, 9 and 15, Davis does not disclose the text

representation of the number is converted into a description of the number's format by a

translation instruction using a translate table. Omori teaches converting text data into a

number using a table (p.11, para. 166). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art, having the teachings of Davis and Omori before him at the time the

invention was made, to modify the conversion taught by Davis to include using a table

as taught by Omori, because using a table to perform the conversion, as taught by

Omori (p.11, para. 166), would provide a standard set of conversions to be used when

converting text into numbers.

6.   Claims 5, 11 and 17 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Davis in view of Bratt et al. (U.S. Patent 4525780; date of patent

June 25, 1985; filed May 31, 1984).

Regarding dependent claims 5, 11 and 17, Davis does not disclose the mapping of

the description of the number's format to a sequence of conversion code comprises

mapping the description of the number's format to an index which is used to transfer

control to the sequence of conversion code corresponding to the description of the

number's format. Bratt teaches mapping to an index and the index being used in

processing (col. 66, lines 30-32; col. 449, lines 2-7). It would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Davis and Bratt before him at the time

the invention was made, to modify the mapping taught by Davis to include an index as

taught by Bratt, because mapping to an index and using the index for processing, as

taught by Bratt (col. 66, lines 30-32; col. 449, lines 2-7), would provide a reference to a

database or table used in the conversion process.

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicants' arguments filed June 5, 2006 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive. Regarding amended independent claim 1, Applicants indicate that Davis

does not disclose converting the text representation of the number into a description of

the number's format (p.6, para. 6). The Examiner disagrees because Davis teaches

converting the text representation of the number into a description of the number's

format (Fig. 2, 3, 6; col. 3, lines 50-53; col. 5, lines 48-50). In other words, Davis

teaches converting text to a TCanonicalNumber, which is linked to a formatter. The text

is converted to a TCanonicalNumber that is further converted to the binary level by a

TCanonicalNumberFormatter. The binary level is a description of the number's format.

Applicants further traverse the Examiner's citation from Davis for disclosing the

claim requirement of mapping the description of the number's format to a sequence of

conversion code (p.7, para. 1). The Examiner disagrees because Davis teaches

mapping the description of the number's format to a sequence of conversion code (col.

3, lines 50-53; col. 15, lines 41-60). In other words, Davis teaches using a

TCanonicalNumberFormatter to convert the TCanonicalNumber through the virtual

method TextToCanonicalNumber. The TCanonicalNumber is mapped to the conversion

code used to convert text to a number. The TCanonicalNumber is input into the

TextToCanonicalNumber method, so the description of the format has been mapped to

the conversion code.

Applicants further traverse the Examiner's citation from Davis for disclosing the

claim requirement of converting the text representation of the number into the numeric

representation of the number by use of the sequence of conversion code (p.7, para. 5).

The Examiner disagrees because Davis teaches converting the text representation of

the number into the numeric representation of the number by use of the sequence of

conversion code (Fig. 3, 6; col. 3, lines 50-53, 65-67; col. 4, lines 1-2; col. 5, lines 48-50;

col. 15, lines 54-60). In other words, Davis teaches converting text to a number using

the TCanonicalNumber and TCanonicalNumberFormatter. The TCanonicalNumber is

converted into the binary number using the conversion methods.

Independent claims 7 and 13 are rejected under the same rationale as the

rejection for independent claim 1 above.

Claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-18 depend from independent claims 1, 7 and 13.

Therefore claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-18 are rejected at least based on the rationale of the

rejection above.

Regarding dependent claims 4, 10 and 16, Applicants argue that Davis does not

teach that the sequence of conversion code for converting the text representation of the

number into the numeric representation of the number comprises an assignment

statement (p.8, para. 4). The Examiner disagrees because Davis teaches the sequence

of conversion code for converting the text representation of the number into the numeric

representation of the number comprises an assignment statement (col. 9, lines 40-62; col. 10, lines 7-22; col. 15, lines 41-52). Davis teaches set statements used when converting text into a number, and the set statements are making assignments.

Regarding dependent claims 6, 12 and 18, Applicants argue that Davis does not teach that if the text representation of the number does not convert into the description of the number's format, then not executing the subsequent mapping and converting steps (p.9, para. 2). The Examiner disagrees because Davis teaches if the text representation of the number does not convert into the description of the number's format, then not executing the subsequent mapping and converting steps (col. 5, lines 48-55). Davis teaches not converting text when the number is out of bounds. The number is not converted, so the mapping to the conversion methods is not carried out and the closest number is returned.

Regarding dependent claims 2, 8 and 14, Applicants argue that the dependent claims are patentable over the cited art because they depend from base claims 1, 7 and 13, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above in the arguments (p. 9, para. 7). The independent claims have been rejected based on the Davis reference and claims 2, 8 and 14 are rejected at least based on the rationale of those rejections.

Regarding dependent claims 3, 9 and 15, Applicants argue that the dependent

claims are patentable over the cited art because they depend from base claims 1, 7 and

13, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above in the

arguments (p. 9, para. 8). The independent claims have been rejected based on the

Davis reference and claims 3, 9 and 15 are rejected at least based on the rationale of

those rejections.

Regarding dependent claims 5, 11 and 17, Applicants argue that the dependent

claims are patentable over the cited art because they depend from base claims 1, 7 and

13, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above in the

arguments (p. 10, para. 7). The independent claims have been rejected based on the

Davis reference and claims 5, 11 and 17 are rejected at least based on the rationale of

those rejections.

Conclusion

8.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Kristina B. Honeycutt whose telephone number is 571-

272-4123. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm Monday-

Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KBH

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER